DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 268 606 CS 505 260

AUTHOR Staley, Constance Courtney; Shockley-Zalabak, Pamela
TITLE A Communication Profile of the Female Professional: An Exploratory Study.
PUB DATE Feb 86
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Tucson, AZ, February 15-19, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication (Thought Transfer); Communication Skills; *Females; Interpersonal Communication; Metacognition; Nonverbal Communication; *Organizational Communication; Personnel Evaluation; *Professional Personnel; Self Evaluation (Individuals); Social Cognition; Verbal Communication
IDENTIFIERS Communication Behavior; Communication Indicators; Communication Patterns; *Communication Styles; *Communicator Style

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the communication style of professional women in the work force. Subjects, 122 female professionals who had previously participated in a university sponsored management development workshop, completed a demographic profile sheet, the 51-question Norton Communicator Style Measure (CSM), and a communication proficiency assessment instrument measuring critical organizational communication skills that had been identified through a review of the literature. Results were then analyzed to determine whether unique combinations of style variables could predict professional females' achievement levels or supervisor and self-evaluations of communications proficiency, and whether there are unique combinations or communication styles that predict the communicator image of female professionals. The results showed that unique combinations of communicator style variables could not be used to predict female achievement levels or supervisory proficiency ratings. However, some unique combinations of communicator style variables did appear to predict female self-proficiency ratings and overall communicator image. (DF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED268606

A COMMUNICATION PROFILE OF THE FEMALE PROFESSIONAL: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

Constance Courtney Staley
Department of Communication
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
P O Box 7150
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80933-7150
(303) 593-3486

Pamela Shockley-Zalabak
Department of Communication
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80933-7150
(303) 593-3159

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Constance Courtney Staley
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 505260

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the results of an exploratory investigation of the communication style of professional women in the work force. Specifically, we were guided by the following research questions: How does the female professional communicate? Do unique combinations of style variables predict female professionals' achievement levels or supervisor and self evaluations of communications proficiency? Furthermore, are there unique combinations of communication styles which predict the communicator image of female professionals? In this research, unique combinations of communicator style variables failed to predict female achievement levels or supervisory proficiency ratings. On the other hand, unique combinations of communicator style variables did predict female self proficiency ratings and overall communicator image.

A COMMUNICATION PROFILE OF THE FEMALE PROFESSIONAL: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

In recent years, researchers have become increasingly interested in the communication of women (Eakins & Eakins, 1978; Henley, 1977; Key, 1975; Lakoff, 1975; Pearson, 1985; Smith, 1979; Thorne & Henley, 1975). Often female speech has been characterized by comparing males and females, either by identifying actual sex differences or by uncovering stereotyped perceptions. From this latter perspective, for example, Kramer (1976, 1977) found that female speech is perceived to be friendly, gentle, enthusiastic, smooth, and trivial--"kind and correct, but unimportant" (1977, p. 159). Male speech, on the other hand, is seen as forceful, loud, dominating, and straight to the point.

This paper presents the results of an exploratory investigation of the communication style of professional women in the work force. We used Norton's communicator style construct as a conceptual framework (Norton, 1978). Norton has identified ten styles relating to "the way one verbally and nonverbally interacts to signal how literal meaning should be taken, interpreted, filtered, or understood" (Montgomery & Norton, 1981, p. 122). These subconstructs of Norton's Communicator Style Measure include: impression leaving, contentious, open, dramatic, dominant, precise,

---

Research funded in part by a Grant from the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs Research and Creative Works Committee.

relaxed, friendly, attentive, and animated. An eleventh variable, communicator image, is included as a dependent assessment of communicator ability (Norton, 1983).

Montgomery and Norton (1981), using the Communicator Style Measure, investigated sex differences in self perceptions of communicator style. They found that males see themselves as significantly more precise than females see themselves, that females report higher levels of animated styles than males, and that dominant and impression leaving styles consistently predicted communicator image for both sexes. Talley and Richmond (1980), however, found that psychological gender orientation did not have a demonstrable effect on perceived, as opposed to self reported, communicator style.

Current literature indicates that perceived communication skills may be strong predictors of organizational advancement for the female professional (Shockley-Zalabak & Staley, 1984). With increasing numbers of women entering the work force generally, and managerial-administrative ranks specifically (Staley, 1984), investigating female professionals' communication style may represent a timely and relevant issue.

Even though studies of sex differences primarily compare and contrast male and female behaviors, they contain within them a profile of the female communicator. And since much is to be learned from the plethora of studies on sex differences for the general population and few studies focus on such differences within organizational contexts, we will briefly review both types of literature. The review is organized around major variable clusters.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Dominant, Contentious, Precise Styles

Communication dominance is defined by Markel, Long and Saine (1973) as "any device or strategy . . . which lessens the communication role of another" (p. 356). Fitzpatrick and Bochner (1981) found that males perceive that they use more controlling communication behaviors than do females. Many controlling behaviors identified were negative (belittling, exploiting, ridiculing, etc.), and while males perceived themselves using such strategies infrequently, they nevertheless perceived that they use such strategies more often than females. Females, on the other hand, perceive that they seek more help, guidance, and support than males.

Despite cultural stereotypes, studies indicate that men talk more than women (Eakins & Eakins, 1976; Swacker, 1975; Wood, 1966). They also appear to exert conversational dominance. According to Fishman (1978), in male-female conversations, topics are pursued by the dyad much more often if they are introduced by the male. Women's communication is also perceived to be less assertive than that of men. Females, for example, give more compound or longer requests, as opposed to direct requests or orders (Thorne & Henley, 1975; Zimmerman & West, 1975), and men interrupt others more often than women (Baird, 1976; Eakins & Eakins, 1978; Kramer, 1974; Thorne & Henley, 1975; Zimmerman & West, 1975).

The contentious subconstruct refers to argumentative and aggressive behaviors in communication. Men have been found to use more hostile verbs than women (Gilley & Summers, 1970) and more words referring to destructive action (Gleser, Gottschalk, & Watkins, 1959). Rich-Siebzehner (1979) found that females used fewer expletives on a written questionnaire, although

Staley (1978), investigating the same issue, found that males and females used approximately the same number of expletives.

Relating to the precise subconstruct, most studies indicate that females use more precise language than do males. Crosby and Nyquist (1977), for example, found that females used more hypercorrect language than males, and Labov (1972) found that females use more correct speech forms. On the other hand, women tend to use more qualifiers than do men (Crosby & Nyquist, 1977), and women in mixed-sex dyads use more fillers (Hirschman, 1975). The precise construct, however, also refers to a concern for documentation and proof in information and argumentative discourse, and research in this area is scarce.

Attentive, Friendly Styles

In general, studies indicate that females exhibit more attentive, friendly behaviors. They use more eye contact (i.e., Ellsworth & Ludwig, 1972; Rubin, 1970; Russo, 1975; Thayer & Schiff, 1975); smile more (Argyle, 1975; Dierks-Stewart, in Pearson, 1985; Frances, 1979; Parlee, 1979), are more apt to return smiles (Henley, 1977); and are better at conveying emotions (Schiffenbauer & Babineau, 1976). Women are expected to speak politely regardless of the conversational topic while men are expected to vary their speech depending on context (Kemper, 1984). Males, on the other hand, perceive themselves as relatively more detached from social interaction than do females (Fitzpatrick & Bochner, 1981).

Open Style

According to Montgomery and Norton (1981), "an open style signals that the content of a message is representational of a communicator's actual feelings, beliefs, and opinions" (p. 125). In examining the literature on

sex differences in self-disclosure, the majority of studies show that women disclose more than men (Pearson, 1985); however, males report intentions to disclose at a higher rate than females (Gilbert & Whiteneck, 1976; Sermat & Smyth, 1973). Females also tend to disclose more negative information about themselves than do males (Critelli & Newman, 1978). Donnell and Hall (1980), however, in their study of nearly 2000 male and female managers, found that females were less candid and open with their colleagues than were their male counterparts. Furthermore, subordinates of female managers reported that they solicited less feedback from their superiors than did subordinates of male managers.

Relaxed Style

Research indicates that females are less relaxed than males in their nonverbal behaviors (Mehrabian, 1971). Women also report slightly more public speaking apprehension than men (McCroskey, Simpson, & Richmond, 1982). According to Maccoby and Jacklin's extensive review on sex differences, many studies report that girls are more timid than boys (1974). Boys, for example, are more likely to receive psychological counseling for aggressive, anti-social behavior while girls are more likely to be counseled for excessive fears and feelings of inferiority (Clifton & Lee, 1976).

Animated, Dramatic Styles

Animated, dramatic communicator styles "serve to exaggerate or color communication content" through frequency, amount, and intensity of eye contact, gestures, facial expressions and body movement (Montgomery & Norton, 1981, p. 126). Women establish more eye contact than do men (Ellsworth & Ludwig, 1972; Muirhead & Morton, 1979; Russo, 1975; Rubin,

1970; Thayer & Schiff, 1975); however they also avert their gaze more than men (Dierks-Stewart, 1979, in Pearson, 1985). Women also use more facial expression and are more expressive than men (Buck, Miller, & Caul, 1974; Mehrabian, 1972). On the other hand, women use fewer gestures than men (Peterson, 1976) and exhibit more closed body positions (Aries, 1982).

Few studies have compared the use of dramatic communication styles by males and females. Mulac, Lundell, and Bradac found that female public speakers are perceived to be less dynamic than their male counterparts (1982). Aries, in describing group behavior, describes males as sharing stories and laughing, telling anecdotes, and dramatizing (1977). Males are also generally reported to use humor much more often than females (Coser, 1960).

Impression Leaving, Communicator Image

Few studies focus on the impact a male versus a female communicator has upon his/her interactional partners. If, as Montgomery and Norton indicate, impression leaving is based more on nonverbal cues than on verbal content, the mixed literature on nonverbal cues makes reaching a conclusion on this construct difficult. Women, for instance, use more eye contact but fewer gestures and assertive postures. It is therefore problematic to say that they leave more or less of an impression than their male counterparts. The same is true of a general assessment of the effectiveness of male and female communicators' style or image.

While much research focuses on sex differences in the communication of the general population, fewer studies examine such differences within organizational contexts. Birdsall (1980) compared the communication style of male and female managers during a staff meeting by developing a category

system for coding communication behaviors--rules information, fact information, value information, control, support, play, and authority reference. Male and female styles were found to be similar. Other studies have compared male versus female behaviors in such areas as leadership (i.e., Bartol, 1977; S. M. Brown, 1979; Hollander & Yoder, 1980; Osborn & Vicars, 1976; White, DeSanctis, & Crino, 1981), preferred conflict style (Shockley, 1981), performance evaluation (i.e., Dipboys & Wiley, 1977; Nieva & Gutek, 1980; Rosen & Jerdee, 1973; White, Crino, & DeSanctis, 1981), and dominance (i.e., Bardwick, 1971; Hall & Black, 1979; Mayes, 1979; Swanson & Wagner, 1979; Wiley & Eskilson, 1982, 1984).

While studies comparing male and female communication may be found, we know of no research which attempts to develop a communication profile for female professionals. Researchers have profiled highly successful women (L. K. Brown, 1979; Hennig & Jardim, 1977) and found that they see themselves, as compared with most women, as more self-reliant, independent, self-confident, and resourceful. By comparison with their male counterparts, these women see themselves as more intuitive, compassionate, empathetic, and less inclined to use power ("The Successful Woman," 1985). Such profiles, however, do not focus on communication behavior, nor do they describe women across all levels within organizations.

Research Questions

In light of research presented thus far, this project was undertaken to begin to develop a communicator style profile for female professionals and relate that profile to organizational outcomes. Specifically, we asked how the female professional communicates. Do unique combinations of style variables predict female professionals' achievement levels or supervisor

and self-evaluations of communication proficiency? Furthermore, are there unique combinations of communication styles which predict the communicator image of female professionals?

METHOD

Subjects and Procedures

Subjects for the study were 122 female professionals from the _____ community who were among 250 participants in a University management development workshop sometime over the previous two years. All subjects were asked to complete a demographic profile sheet, the 51-question Norton Communicator Style Measure (CSM) and a communication proficiency assessment instrument measuring critical organizational communication skills identified in current literature. Additionally 61 direct supervisors (92% of whom were male) of 61 of the female participants completed the communication proficiency assessment on their particular subordinate. Questionnaires were coded to permit matching of supervisor and subordinate responses.

The demographic profile questionnaire collected data about participant educational background, employment type, years in work force, numbers of vertical levels in organization, number of participant promotions, and future employment expectations. The 51-question Norton Communicator Style Measure assessed 10 independent style subconstructs with four items per subconstruct. The communicator styles are: friendly, impression leaving, relaxed, contentious/argumentative, attentive, precise, animated/ expressive, dramatic, open, and dominant. The eleventh subconstruct, communicator image, was treated as a dependent variable. Forty-five items were scored with six eliminated as filler items. Norton (1983) provides a

detailed description of the subconstructs and the scoring, reliability, and validity of the CSM. Talley and Richmond (1980), however, caution researchers about the instrument's limitations.

The communication skills instrument was used for self and supervisory proficiency assessment in the following categories: business writing, interviewing, group decision-making processes, oral presentations, managing conflict, leadership/management techniques, interpersonal relationships, communications technology (computers, telecommunication, etc.), listening, motivating people, handling grievances, giving directions, delegating authority, negotiating skills, and diagnosing organizational problems. These specific proficiency categories have been identified in recent communication literature (Hanna, 1978; DiSalvo, 1980) as critical competencies in the organizational setting. For each proficiency assessment a scale of one to seven was used to rate the degree of proficiency for each competency. Rating description ranged from weak to exceptional. An average across the 15 categories was calculated to establish self and supervisor communication proficiency scores. Cronbach's alphas for the scales were .92 for supervisors and .82 for subordinates.

Analysis

Descriptive data were compiled to profile participants by employment type, educational background, and future employment expectations. Of the 122 females, 28 were support or technical personnel, 44 were technical professionals, 25 were supervisors, 11 were managers, and 14 were unidentified. Participating women had been in the work force an average of 12.5 years and had spent an average of 6.4 years with their present employer. The majority had entered the work force between ages 20-24 and

the current average age range was 31-40. Survey participants were highly educated with 41.7 percent reporting college attendance and an additional 40.5 percent indicating undergraduate or graduate degrees. In addition, particular demographic information was used to compute Managerial Achievement Quotients (MAQ): the number of promotions received since initial employment with the organization for which they now work and current age (20-24, 25-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, over 60). The formula for the MAQ groupings in this research was:

$$MAQ = \frac{5 \text{ (no of promotions)}}{\text{(mean age } -20) \ 100}$$

This approach is a modification of the Rhodes Managerial Achievement Quotient reported in both Blake and Mouton (1964) and Hall and Donnell (1979). Specifically MAQ categorizes a population into achievement levels, ranging from low to high. In the numerator, the number 5 is a constant progression factor which represents time in grade per number of career moves available if one spent his or her 40-year work life in an eight-level (the number of levels identified by Blake and Mouton in their original study) organization and which reflects potential upward mobility, assuming the absence of intervening forces such as seniority, politics, etc. The denominator provides a seniority index. Finally, a constant multiplier of 100 is used to eliminate decimals.

Stepwise multiple regression was used to identify whether unique communicator style variable combinations could be isolated to predict female achievement levels (MAQ), self and supervisor proficiency ratings, and overall communicator image.

RESULTS

Unique combinations of communicator style variables did not predict female professionals' achievement levels (MAQ), (Multiple R = .32, F9, 74 = .93, $p \leq .503$), or supervisor communication proficiency ratings (Multiple R = .23, F 9, 99 = .61, $p \leq .786$). Unique variable combinations did predict self communication proficiency ratings and overall communicator image.

Collectively, 10 variables were shown to be statistically significant (F 10, 98 = 3.28, $p < .001$) for predicting self communication proficiency ratings. These 10 variables accounted for .25 of the variance with an adjusted R^2 of .17 (Table 1). Three of the variables--relaxed, open, and impression leaving--contributed significantly to the equation. An examination of the regression coefficients from the equation identified six of the variables as contributing to higher self proficiency ratings with the remaining four negatively related to proficiency. Specifically, relaxed, open, impression leaving, dramatic, precise, and friendly style usage contributed to higher proficiency ratings with animated, dominant, attentive styles and overall communicator image scores negatively related to higher self ratings.

In terms of predicting the overall communicator image for female professionals, nine variables were shown to be statistically significant (F 9, 99 = 5.67, $p < .0001$). The 9 variables accounted for .34 of the variance and an adjusted R^2 of .28 (Table 2). Three of the variables--dominant, friendly, and impression leaving--contributed significantly to the equation. Regression coefficients for dominant, friendly, impression leaving, dramatic, relaxed, and attentive styles identified these variables as contributing to higher overall communication image while argumentative/

contentious, animated, and precise subconstructs contributed to lower image.

DISCUSSION

In this research, unique combinations of communicator style variables failed to predict female achievement levels or supervisory proficiency ratings while predicting female self proficiency ratings and overall communicator image. Specifically, these results suggest that self perception of communication style is influential as it relates to self concept (proficiency assessments) and communicator image, but insufficient to explain supervisory communication assessment or actual achievement levels.

Although previous research has demonstrated that proficiency assessments (self and supervisory) are predictive of actual achievement levels, the present findings support the concept of communication style as a subtle and indirect influence on proficiency assessments and promotional progress. For example, the more highly proficient a female sees herself the more likely she is to utilize particular style constructs. The female professional may be choosing styles and behaviors in particular skill areas based on her belief that proficiency in those areas is related to the choice of appropriate styles. On the other hand, her supervisor, who usually is in charge of promotions, evaluates overall skills and appropriateness of behaviors, not whether that skill/behavior was a particular style--open, dramatic, or relaxed, etc.

It is in this subtle area of female self concept and image as it relates to communication style where the present findings contribute most to our understanding. Of particular interest are the differences in the

variables predicting positive self evaluation of organizational communication competencies and those predicting overall communicator image--"a general assessment of the effectiveness of a person's style of communicating" (Montgomery & Norton, 1981). Specifically, when predicting higher self competency ratings, relaxed, open, and impression leaving subconstructs account for .23 of the explained variance. Conversely, the dominant subconstruct is negatively related to higher proficiency ratings. In terms of overall communicator image, dominant, friendly, and impression leaving subconstructs account for .30 of the variance with the dominant variable alone accounting for .15. Furthermore, the open subconstruct, previously identified as the best overall predictor of a good communicator image (Norton, 1983), does not make it into the image equation for female professionals.

While these results may appear unusual, previous research may provide helpful explanations. Norton (1983), for example, reports that impression leaving, whether positive or negative, is closely related to communicator image. For dominant groups, open and attentive subconstructs are good overall image predictors while relaxed and open styles are the best predictors for nondominant groups. Interestingly enough, it is in this area of dominant communication behavior where professional women are subjected to mixed messages and role controversy.

It is not surprising, therefore, that female professionals who give themselves higher ratings on specific organizational communication competencies exhibit an overall communication profile high in relaxation, openness, and positive impression leaving but low in dominance. These same professionals, however, when predicting overall image, identify dominant,

friendly, and impression leaving as important style subconstructs. It may be that female professionals see dominant behavior as an important part of a good communicator image; however, they are less likely to give themselves higher communication proficiency ratings if they perceive themselves as highly dominant communicators. In other words, while dominance (perhaps envisioned as assertive communication) may represent an ideal communication style, their own experience may indicate that counter-stereotypical behaviors in organizations often produce negative results. A body of research (i.e., Bardwick, 1971; Hall & Black, 1979; Mayes, 1979; Swanson & Wagner, 1979; Wiley & Eskilson, 1982, 1984) would attest to the generally negative consequences of dominant behavior for the female communicator.

These results raise important questions about the influence of the organizational context on the communication behaviors of female professionals. Further work is needed to determine whether and to what extent the organizational context discourages female professionals from using the dominant style even though its use contributes to perceptions of good communicator image. Future research should also investigate this issue with regard to males and should determine whether unique combinations of style variables predict male professionals' achievement levels or self and supervisory evaluations. Particular attention should be paid as to whether self report communicator style instruments can be related to supervisory evaluations.

While researchers have profiled the highly successful female professional (i.e., L. K. Brown, 1979; Hennig & Jardim, 1977), they have not focused on female professionals across organizational levels, nor have they focused specifically on communication behaviors as critical components

of organizational effectiveness and vertical mobility (i.e., Hanna, 1978; DiSalvo, 1980). The research presented here represents an initial attempt to develop a communication profile for female professionals and, more generally, to investigate the important issue of communication style within the organizational context.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Argyle, M. (1975). Bodily communication. New York: International Universities Press.

Aries, E. (1977). Interpersonal styles in all male, all female, and mixed groups. In A. Sargent (Ed.), Beyond Sex Roles (pp. 292-299). St. Paul, MN: West.

Aries, E. (1982). Verbal and nonverbal behavior in single-sex and mixed-sex groups. Psychological Reports, 51, 127-134.

Baird, J. (1976). Sex differences in group communication: A review of relevant research. The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 62, 179-192.

Bardwick, J. M. (1971). Psychology of women: A study of biocultural conflicts. New York: Harper and Row.

Bartol, K. M. (1977). Male versus female leaders: A review of comparative literature. Syracuse, NY: School of Management.

Birdsall, P. (1980). A comparative analysis of male and female managerial communication style in two organizations. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 16, 183-196.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). The managerial grid. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company.

Brown, L. K. (1979). Women and business management. Signs, 5, 266-288.

Brown, S. M. (1979). Male versus female leaders: A comparison of critical studies. Sex Roles, 5 (5), 595-611.

Buck, R., Miller, R. E., & Caul, W. F. (1974). Sex, personality, and physiological variables in the communication of affect via facial expression. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30, 587-596.

Clifton, A. L., & Lee, D. E. (1976). Self-destructive consequences of sex-role socialization. Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, 6 (1), 11-22.

Coser, R. L. (1960). Laughter among colleagues. Psychiatry, 23, 81-95.

Critelli, J. W., & Neumann, K. F. (1978). An interpersonal analysis of self-disclosure and feedback. Social Behavior and Personality, 6, 173-177.

Crosby, F., & Nyquist, L. (1977). The female register: An empirical study of Lakoff's hypotheses. Language in Society, 6, 313-322.

Dipboye, R. L., & Wiley, J. N. (1977). Reactions of college recruiters as a function of interviewee's sex and self-presentation style. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 10, 1-12.

DiSalvo, V. (1980). A summary of current research: Identifying communication skills in various organizational contexts. Communication Education, 29, 283-290.

Donnell, S., & Hall, J. (1980) Men and women as managers: A significant case of no significant differences. The Woodlands, TX: Telemetrics International.

Eakins, B., & Eakins, G. (1976). Verbal turn-taking and exchanges in faculty dialogue. In B. L. Dubois & I. Crouch (Eds.) Papers in Southwest English IV: Proceedings of the Conference on the Sociology of the Languages of American Women (pp. 53-62). San Antonio, TX: Trinity University.

Eakins, B. W., & Eakins, R. Gene (1978). Sex differences in human communication. Boston, Mass: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Ellsworth, P. E. & Ludwig, L. M. (1972). Visual behavior in social interaction. Journal of Communication, 22, 375-403.

Fishman, Pm. M. (1978). Interaction: The work women do. Social Problems, 25, 397-406.

Fitzpatrick, M. A, & Bochner, A. (1981). Perspectives on self and others: Male-female differences in perceptions of communication behavior. Sex Roles, 7, 523-534.

Frances, S. J. (1979). Sex differences in nonverbal behavior. Sex Roles, 5, 519-535.

Gilbert, S. H., & Whiteneck, G. G. (1976). Toward a multi-dimensional approach to the study of self-disclosure. Human Communication Research, 2, 347-355.

Gilley, H. M., & Summers, C. (1970). Sex differences in the use of hostile verbs. Journal of Psychology, 76, 33-37.

Gleser, G. C., Gottschalk, L. A., & Watkins, J. (1959). The relationship of sex and intelligence to choice of words: A normative study of verbal behavior. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 15, 182-191.

Hall, J. R., & Black, J. D. (1979). Assertiveness, aggressiveness, and attitudes toward feminism. The Journal of Social Psychology, 107, 57-62.

Hall, J., & Donnell, S. M. (1979). Managerial achievement: The personal side of behavioral theory. Human Relations, 32 (1), 77-101.

Hanna, M. S. (1978). Speech communication training needs in the business community. Central States Speech Journal, 29, 163-172.

Henley, N. M. (1977). Body politics: power, sex, and nonverbal communication. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hennig, M., & Jardim, A. (1977). The managerial woman. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press, Doubleday.

Hirschman, L. (1975). Female-male differences in conversational interaction. Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance, (abstract only) 249.

Hollander, E. P., & Yoder, J. (1980). Some issues comparing women and men as leaders. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 1 (3), 267-280.

Kemper, S. (1984). When to speak like a lady. Sex Roles, 10 (5/6), 435-443.

Key, M. R. (1975). Male/female language. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow.

Kramer, C. R. (1974). Women's speech: Separate but unequal? Quarterly Journal of Speech, 60, 14-24.

Kramer, C. (1976). Women's and men's perceptions of female and male speech. Dissertation Abstracts International, 9, 5636A (University Microfilms No. 76-6827)

Kramer, C. (1977). Perceptions of female and male speech. Language and Speech, 20, 151-161.

Labov, W. (1972). Sociolinguistic Patterns. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.

Lakoff, R. (1975). Language and woman's place. New York: Harper & Row.

Maccoby, E., & Jacklin, C. (1974). The psychology of sex differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Markel, N. N., Long, J. F. R., & Saine, T. J. (1976). Sex effects in conversational interaction: Another look at male dominance. Human Communication Research, 2, 356-364.

Mayes, S. S. (1979). Women in positions of authority: A case study of changing roles. Signs, 4 (3), 556-568.

McCroskey, J. C., Simpson, T., & Richmond, V. P. (1982). Biological sex and communication apprehension. Communication Quarterly, 30, 129-133.

Mehrabian, A. (1972). Nonverbal Communication. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton.

Montgomery, B. M., & Norton, R. W. (1981). Sex differences and similarities in communicator style. Communication Monograph, 48, 121-132.

Muirhead, R. D., & Goldman, M. (1979). Mutual eye contact as affected by seating position, sex, and age. The Journal of Social Psychology, 109, 201-206.

Mulac, A., Torborg, L. L., & Bradac, J. J. (1982). An empirical test of the gender-linked language effect in a public speaking setting. Language and Speech 25, 243-256.

Nieva, V., & Gutek, B. (1980). Sex effects on evaluation. Academy of Management Review, 5 (2), 267-276.

Norton, R. W. (1978). Foundations of a communicator style construct. Human Communication Research, 4, 99-112.

Norton, R. (1983). Communicator style: Theory, application and measures. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Osborn, R. N., & Vicars, W. M. (1976). Sex stereotypes: An artifact in leader behavioral and subordinate satisfaction analysis? Academy of Management Journal, 19, 439-449.

Parlee, M. B. (1979). Women smile less for success. Psychology Today, 12, 16.

Pearson, J. C. (1985). Gender and Communication. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.

Peterson, P. (1976). An investigation of sex differences in regard to nonverbal body gestures. In B. Eakins & B. Lieb-Brilhart (Eds.), Siscom '75: Women's (and men's) communication (pp. 20-27). Falls Church, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Rich-Siebzehner, M. M. (1979). Sex differences in the development of verbal social responses. Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 7053A-7054A. (University Microfilms No. 7913158).

Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T. H. (1973). The influence of sex-role stereotypes on evaluation of male and female supervisory behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60 (3), 340-344.

Rubin, Z. (1970). Measurement of romantic love. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16, 265-273.

Russo, N. F. (1975). Eye contact, interpersonal distance, and the equilibrium theory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 497-502.

Schiffenbauer, A., & Babineau, A. (1976). Sex role stereotypes and the spontaneous attribution of emotion. Journal of Research in Personality, 10, 137-145.

Sermat, V., & Smyth, M. (1973). Content analysis of verbal communication in the development of relationships: Conditions influencing self-disclosure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 26, 332-346.

Shockley, P. S. (1981). The effects of sex differences on the preference for utilization of conflict styles of managers in a work setting: An exploratory study. Public Personnel Management, 10 (3), 289-295.

Shockley-Zalabak, P. & Staley, C. (1984). The female professional: Communication proficiencies as predictors of organizational advancement. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Smith, P. M. (1979). Sex markers in speech. In K. R. Scherer & H. Giles (Eds.), Social markers in speech (pp. 109-146). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Staley, C. (1978). Male-female use of expletives: A heck of a difference in expectations. Anthropological Linguistics, 20, 367-380.

Staley, C. (1984). Managerial women in mixed groups: Implications of recent research. Group and Organization Studies 9 (3), 316-332.

Swacker, M. (1975). The sex of the speaker as a sociolinguistic variable. In B. Thorne & N. Henley (Eds.), Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Swanson, C., & Wagner, K. A. (1979). From Machiavelli to Ms.: Differences in male-female power styles. Business or Public Administration Review, 39, 66-72.

Talley, M. A. & Richmond, V. P. (1980). The relationship between psychological gender orientation and communicative style. Human Communication Research, 6, 326-339.

Thayer, S., & Schiff, W. (1975). Eye-contact, facial expression, and the experience of time. The Journal of Social Psychology, 95, 117-124. The successful woman. (1985, January). Forbes, p. 9.

Thorne, B. & Henley, N. (1975). Difference and dominance: An overview of language, gender, and society. Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance, 5-31.

White, M. C., Crino, M. D., & DeSanctis, G. L. (1981). A critical review of female performance, performance training and organizational initiatives designed to aid women in the work-role environment. Personnel Psychology, 34 (2), 227-248.

White, M. C., DeSanctis, G., & Crino, M. D. (1981). Achievement, self-confidence, personality traits, and leadership ability: A review of literature on sex differences. Psychological Reports, 48 (2), 547-569.

Wiley, M. G., & Eskilson, A. (1982). Coping in the corporation: Sex role constraints. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 12, 1-11.

Wiley, M. G., & Eskilson, A. (1984, August). Speech style, gender stereotypes, and corporate success: What if women talk more like men? Paper presented at the meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Antonio, TX.

Wood, M. N. (1966). The influence of sex and knowledge of communication effectiveness on spontaneous speech. Word, 22, 117-137.

Zimmerman, D. H., & West, C. (1975). Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation. In B. Thorne & N. Henley (Eds.), Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance, Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

TABLE 1

Summary of Step-Wise Regression Analysis for Predicting Proficiency Rating

Style Subconstructs	Multiple R	R^2	R^2 Change	r	Beta	F to Enter
Relaxed*	0.360	0.130	0.130	0.361	0.273	16.00
Open*	0.445	0.198	0.068	0.304	0.213	9.03
Impression leaving*	0.482	0.232	0.034	0.309	0.198	4.70
Dramatic	0.490	0.241	0.008	0.271	0.123	1.07
Precise	0.494	0.244	0.004	0.163	0.064	.51
Animated	0.498	0.248	0.004	0.778	-0.071	.48
Communicator Image	0.500	0.250	0.002	0.171	-0.055	.32
Dominant	0.500	0.250	0.000	0.192	-0.021	.03
Friendly	0.501	0.251	0.000	0.100	0.019	.02
Attentive	0.501	0.251	0.000	0.041	-0.174	.03

*F statistic computed to enter or remove variable significant at $p<.05$.

TABLE 2

Summary of Step-Wise Regression Analysis for Predicting Communicator Image

Style Subconstructs	Multiple R	R^2	R^2 Change	r	Beta	F to Enter
Dominant*	0.390	0.152	0.152	0.390	0.287	19.21
Friendly*	0.483	0.233	0.081	0.318	0.248	11.23
Impression leaving*	0.543	0.295	0.062	0.359	0.209	9.17
Dramatic	0.555	0.308	0.013	0.326	0.154	1.90
Argumentative/ Contentious	0.565	0.319	0.012	0.002	-0.078	1.76
Relaxed	0.576	0.332	0.012	0.237	0.114	1.89
Attentive	0.578	0.334	0.003	0.173	0.078	.41
Animated	0.580	0.337	0.003	0.130	-0.069	.40
Precise	0.583	0.340	0.003	0.110	-0.070	.47

*F statistic computed to enter or remove variable significant at $p<.05$.